



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,511	03/30/2004	Hanna Yehuda	EMC04-07(04031)	3209
22468 7590 03/30/2007 CHAPIN & HUANG L.L.C. WESTBOROUGH OFFICE PARK 1700 WEST PARK DRIVE WESTBOROUGH, MA 01581			EXAMINER WONG, WILLIAM	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE 3 MONTHS		MAIL DATE 03/30/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/812,511

Applicant(s)

YEHUDA ET AL.

Examiner

William Wong

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2004 and 15 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the following communication: application filed on March 30, 2004. Claims 1-49 are pending and have been examined.

### ***Double Patenting***

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 23-24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 of copending Application No. 10/675,586. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are not patentably distinct from each other because they set forth subject matters that are obvious over each other. For example, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2178

invention was made to modify the management information of 10/675,586 to include access rights because access control is an important part of managing a storage area network.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Specification***

3. The use of trademarks HITACHI, IBM, and HEWLETT PACKARD has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 1, 9, 13, 14, 25, 38, and 39 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- As per claim 1, there is lack of antecedent basis for "the at least one storage system resource" because it was not previously recited.
- As per claim 9, grammatical correction is required. As best understood by the examiner, the claim should recite "providing an indication of which host resources..."

Art Unit: 2178

- As per claim 13 and 38, there is lack of antecedent basis for the phrase "the user selected storage system" because it was not previously recited.
- As per claim 14 and 39, there is lack of antecedent basis for the phrase "the multiple access ports" because it was not previously recited.
- As per claim 25, grammatical correction of the claim (page 34 lines 1-3) is required. As best understood by the examiner, the claim should recite "receiving a selection of storage ports through which host resources access ...".

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 18 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 18 recites "zoning, pending, locked information", but nowhere in the specification describes this.

Claim 34 recites "zoned, pending or locked", but nowhere in the specification describes this.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 15, 18, 34, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 15 and 40, the term "accessible" already supposes the potential of being accessed. Therefore, the phrase "potentially accessible" raises question as to the scope of the claim and renders the claim indefinite. It is unclear whether storage devices that the host resource cannot access are also represented in the first region.

As per claim 18, grammatical correction is required. It is unclear whether the applicant intended to recite "...zoning, pending, or locked information" or "...zoning, pending, and locked information". For the purposes of examination and taking the broadest reasonable interpretation, the claim is interpreted as reciting "...zoning, pending, or locked information".

As per claim 34, grammatical correction is required. As written, it is unclear what "zoned, pending or locked" is meant to describe in the claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 2178

9. Claims 1-5, 19, 23, 26-30, 44, and 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As per claims 1-5 and 19, a tangible result is required in order for the usefulness of the claims to be realized. Without a tangible result, the claims are merely considered as abstract ideas, in this case, nonfunctional descriptive material. It is noted that providing a user the ability to display does not presuppose the step of displaying. The same reasoning applies to claim 23. As per claim 48, when nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it is not structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium but is merely carried by the medium. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material stored in a computer-readable medium does not make it statutory. Nonfunctional descriptive material may be claimed in combination with other functional descriptive material on a computer-readable medium to provide the necessary functional and structural interrelationship to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101. The same reasoning applies to claims 26-40, 44, and 49.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim 1-6, 8-11, 15-16, 18-24, 26-31, 33-36, 40-41, and 43-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. (US 2003/0149769 A1).

Art Unit: 2178

As per independent claim 1, Axberg teaches a **method for managing access rights of host resources with respect to corresponding storage systems** (in paragraph 1), the method comprising: **receiving a selection of at least one host resource associated with a storage area network** (in paragraph 353); **in addition to receiving the selection of the at least one host resource, receiving a selection of at least one storage parameter associated with the storage area network** (in paragraph 357-358); and **correlating the selection of the at least one host resource with the selection of the at least one storage parameter to identify: i) storage devices of the at least one storage system resource corresponding to the at least one storage parameter** (in paragraph 357-358 and figure 21), and **ii) access control rights of the at least one host resource with respect to the storage devices** (in paragraph 353 and figure 21), but does not specifically teach the selection of at least one storage parameter including **selection of a vendor type associated with the at least one storage system resource**. However, Axberg teaches filtering based on one or more criteria (in paragraph 357 and in figure 21-22), which includes filtering based on vendor type (in paragraph 353 and in figure 21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a vendor type in the teaching of Axberg in order to identify the storage devices corresponding to a particular vendor.

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **via a common and consistent graphical user interface, providing a user an ability to display the access control rights of the at least one host resource**



Art Unit: 2178

**with respect to different vendor types of storage system resources (in paragraph 353).**

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **via the common and consistent graphical user interface, enabling a user to modify access rights associated with the at least one host resource for a selected storage system resource of a selected vendor type (in paragraphs 354-355).**

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **generating vendor specific commands, depending on the selected storage system resource of the selected vendor type (in paragraph 135 and in paragraph 674-675) to modify access rights associated with the storage devices in the selected storage system resource (in paragraphs 354-355).**

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches configuring and/or manage storage devices, which includes modifying access rights (in paragraphs 354-355), using vendor specific commands (in paragraph 674-675), which reads on **for a first selected storage system resource of a first vendor type, generating a first set of vendor specific commands to modify access rights associated with the first selected storage system resource; and for a second selected storage system resource of a second vendor type, generating a second set of vendor specific commands to modify access rights associated with the second selected storage system resource.**

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **generating an output to a display screen** (in paragraph 352 and figure 1); **in a first region on the display screen, displaying multiple icons representing corresponding host resources in the storage area network** (in paragraph 353); **and in relation to at least one of the multiple icons, maintaining corresponding visual regions to receive input commands from a user making the selection of the at least one host resource** (in paragraph 353).

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **providing a view of storage devices associated with the selection of the at least one storage parameter** (in paragraph 357), **the view including a visual indication whether any of the at least one host resource has access rights to a corresponding storage device** (in paragraph 353).

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and as best understood by the examiner, Axberg further teaches **providing an indication which host resources have access rights to corresponding storage devices** (in paragraph 353 and figure 18).

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **in response to receiving a selected parameter, displaying storage system resources associated with the selected parameter** (in paragraphs 357-358); **and providing a unique identifier associated with each of the displayed storage system resources** (in paragraphs 353 and figures 18-21). As explained in claim 1, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 2178

made to select a vendor type in the teaching of Axberg in order to identify the storage devices corresponding to a particular vendor. This selection results in the **displaying of storage system resources associated with the selected vendor type**, which inherently requires **receiving a signal identifying a selected vendor type** prior to the displaying in order to acknowledge the selection.

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **enabling a user to select a storage system resource of the selected parameter** (in paragraphs 354-355 and figures 19-20) and **based on a user selected storage system resource, providing a display of storage devices associated with the at least one host resource and the user selected storage system resource** (in paragraphs 354-355 and figures 19-20).

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and as best understood by the examiner, Axberg further teaches **displaying multiple storage device icons in a first region of a display screen, each storage device icon representing a corresponding storage device potentially accessible by the at least one host resource** (in paragraph 349 and figure 17); and **displaying a related tree selection in a second region of the display screen, the related tree selection indicating which, if any, of the at least one host resource has access rights to the at least one storage device represented by the storage device icons displayed in the first region** (in paragraph 349 and figure 17).

As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **receiving a signal indicating a selected at least one storage device** (in

Art Unit: 2178

paragraphs 354-355); and providing a display for a network manager to modify access rights associated with a selected at least one host resource for accessing the selected at least one storage device (in paragraphs 354-355).

As per claim 18, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and as best understood by the examiner, Axberg further teaches displaying a list of storage devices associated with a selection of a particular storage system of a selected vendor type (in paragraphs 357-358), a table view including a listing of selectable storage device icons as well as corresponding access control information (in paragraphs 353-354), an icon view including a presentation of selectable storage device icons with visual indication of access rights and zoning, pending, locked information (in paragraph 349) and enabling a user to toggle a display view of the storage devices between the table view and the icon view (in paragraph 347, therefore the user inherently is able to toggle between views).

As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, which teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein receiving the selection of the at least one storage parameter includes receiving a selection of a vendor type of storage system resource (see rejection of claim 1).

As per claim 20, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches generating an output for a display screen to display an access relationship to a user (in figure 21), the display screen including: i) a first region for the user to make the selection of the at least one host resource (in figure 21), ii) a second region for the user to make a selection of the at least one storage

**parameter (in figure 21), and iii) a third region for viewing the storage devices associated with the at least one storage parameter (in figure 21).**

As per claim 21, the rejection of claim 20 is incorporated, which includes **wherein receiving the selection of the at least one storage parameter includes receiving a selection of a vendor type of storage system resource (see rejection of claim 1).**

As per claim 22, the rejection of claim 20 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **generating the output for the display screen includes: locating the first region on a left side of the display screen (in figure 21); locating the second region on an upper right portion of the display screen (in figure 21); and locating the third region on a bottom tight portion of the display screen (in figure 21).**

As per independent claim 23, Axberg teaches a **method for displaying access rights of host resources with respect to corresponding storage system resources in a storage area network (in paragraph 1 and 353), the method comprising: receiving an identity of at least one selected host resource associated with the storage area network (in paragraph 25 and 30); retrieving a first managed object from a management database that corresponds to the at least one selected host resource (in paragraph 30); identifying at least one storage system resource associated with the at least one selected host resource based on i) information in the first managed object (in paragraph 30), and ii) information in other corresponding managed objects in the management database (in paragraph 30); and providing a user an ability to display access control rights of the at least one**

Art Unit: 2178

**selected host resource with respect to different vendor types of storage system resources (in paragraph 353).**

As per claim 24, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **extracting information from the first managed object corresponding to the at least one selected host resource (in paragraphs 24-25 and 30); extracting information from other managed objects associated with managed entities in the storage area network (in paragraph 30); storing the information extracted from the first managed object and the other managed objects in corresponding data structures (in paragraph 30); based on processing of information in the data structures, identifying an access relationship between the at least one selected host resource and storage devices associated with the storage system resources (in paragraph 30); and generating an output for a display screen to display the access relationship to a user (in paragraph 353), the display screen including: i) a first region for the user to make the selection of the at least one host resource (in figures 21), ii) a second region for the user to make a selection of at least one storage parameter (in figures 21), and iii) a third region for viewing the storage devices associated with the at least one host resource based on a user selected at least one storage parameter (in figures 21).**

Claims 26-31, 33, 35-36, 40-41, and 43-47 are the computer system claims corresponding to the method claims 1-6, 8, 10-11, 15-16, and 18-22 respectively, and are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6, 8, 10-11, 15-16, and 18-22. Axberg further teaches a **processor (in paragraph**

Art Unit: 2178

133); **a memory unit that stores instructions associated with an application executed by the processor** (in paragraph 463 and 630); **a communication interface that supports communication with other nodes of the storage area network** (in paragraph 17 and paragraph 89); **and an interconnect coupling the processor, the memory unit, and the communication interface** is inherent in order for the **computer system to be enabled to execute the application and perform operations of the** corresponding method claims (see corresponding method claims).

As per claim 34, the rejection of claim 33 is incorporated and as best understood by the examiner, Axberg further teaches **providing an indication which host resources have access rights to corresponding storage devices are zoned, pending or locked** (in paragraph 353 and figure 18).

Claim 48 is the computer program product claim corresponding to the computer system claim 26, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 26. Axberg further teaches **a computer-readable medium having instructions stored thereon for processing data information** (in paragraph 463 and 630), **such that the instructions, when carried out by a processing device** (in paragraph 133), **enable the processing device to perform the steps of the** corresponding method claims (see corresponding method claims).

Claim 49 is a computer system claim corresponding to the computer system claim 26, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 26. Axberg further teaches the means to perform the operations of claim 26 (in paragraph 133).

12. Claims 7 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. (US 2003/0149769 A1) in view of Kekic et al. (US 5,999,179).

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **displaying a hierarchy of multiple icons to facilitate the selection of the at least one host resource associated with the storage area network** (in paragraph 84 and figures 18-22 and 34), but does not specifically teach **enabling a user to expand a view of the hierarchy of multiple icons**. However, Kekic teaches enabling a user to expand and collapse a view of a hierarchy of multiple icons to facilitate selection of host resources (in column 23 lines 63-67, column 24 lines 1-2, and figure 6c). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Axberg with the teaching of Kekic in order to provide the user with the ability to focus in on and display group information relevant to the resource of interest.

Claim 32 is the computer system claim corresponding to the method claim 7, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 7. Axberg further teaches **a processor** (in paragraph 133); **a memory unit that stores instructions associated with an application executed by the processor** (in paragraph 463 and 630); **a communication interface that supports communication with other nodes of the storage area network** (in paragraph 17 and paragraph 89); **and an interconnect coupling the processor, the memory unit, and the communication interface** is inherent in order for the **computer system to be enabled**



Art Unit: 2178

**to execute the application and perform operations of the corresponding method claims (see corresponding method claims).**

13. Claims 12 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. (US 2003/0149769 A1) in view of Person ("Using the AutoFilter", Special Edition Using Microsoft Excel 97, Que, December 17, 1996, pgs. 1-7).

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, but Axberg does not specifically teach **providing a pull-down menu of functional options associated with the selected vendor type, the pull-down menu of functional options including at least one of: i) display physically connected storage system resources associated with the at least one host resource for the selected vendor type; ii) display all storage devices associated with the selected vendor type; and iii) display physically unconnected storage devices associated with the at least one host resource for the selected vendor type.** However, Person teaches providing a pull-down menu of functional options associate with a selected parameter, the pull-down menu of functional options including displaying all associated with a selected parameter (in figure 38.10 and page 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Axberg to include the pull-down menu of Person in order to allow the user to quickly filter the storage devices displayed.

Claim 37 is the computer system claim corresponding to the method claim 12, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of

Art Unit: 2178

claim 12. Axberg further teaches a **processor** (in paragraph 133); a **memory unit that stores instructions associated with an application executed by the processor** (in paragraph 463 and 630); a **communication interface that supports communication with other nodes of the storage area network** (in paragraph 17 and paragraph 89); and an **interconnect coupling the processor, the memory unit, and the communication interface** is inherent in order for the **computer system to be enabled to execute the application and perform operations of the corresponding method** claims (see corresponding method claims).

14. Claims 13-14, 25 and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. (US 2003/0149769 A1) in view of Axberg et al. (US 6009466 A, hereinafter "Axberg2").

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **displaying unique identifiers of storage system resources** (in figures 18-21); and **receiving a signal identifying a user selected storage system resource** (in paragraph 353), but does not specifically teach **for the user selected storage system, displaying access ports associated with accessing the storage devices**. However, Axberg2 teaches displaying access ports associated with accessing storage devices for the user selected storage system (in column 13 lines 7-16 and figure 12E). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Axberg with the teaching of Axberg2 in order to provide the

Art Unit: 2178

user with the ability to determine the ports through which the host resources can access the storage devices.

As per claim 14, the combination of Axberg and Axberg2 teaches the method of claim 13. Additionally, Axberg2 teaches **enabling a user to modify a selection of at least one of the displayed access ports** (in column 13 lines 7-16 and figure 12E); **and receiving a modified selection of the displayed access ports** (in column 13 lines 7-16 and figure 12E) and Axberg teaches **displaying a list of storage devices based on modifications** (in paragraph 353-355).

As per claim 25, the rejection of claim 24 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **receiving a user generated selection of the at least one storage parameter in the second region, the user generated selection including: i) receiving a selection of a parameter of storage system resource** (in paragraphs 357-358); **and ii) receiving a selection of a uniquely identified storage system resource of a selected parameter in step i** (in paragraphs 354-355 and figure 18-21), but does not specifically teach the selection of parameter of storage system resource including a **vendor type**. However, Axberg teaches filtering based on one or more criteria (in paragraph 357 and in figure 21-22), which includes filtering based on vendor type (in paragraph 353 and in figure 21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a vendor type in the teaching of Axberg in order to identify the storage devices corresponding to a particular vendor. As best understood by the examiner, Axberg also does not specifically teach **receiving a user generated selection of storage ports through host resources**

**access the storage devices** of the storage system resources described above.

However, Axberg2 teaches receiving a user generated selection of storage ports through which host resources access storage devices (in column 13 lines 7-16 and figure 12E). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Axberg with the teaching of Axberg2 in order to provide the user with the ability to determine the ports through which the host resources can access the storage devices.

Claims 38 and 39 are the computer system claims corresponding to the method claims 13 and 14 respectively, and are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 13 and 14. Axberg further teaches **a processor** (in paragraph 133); **a memory unit that stores instructions associated with an application executed by the processor** (in paragraph 463 and 630); **a communication interface that supports communication with other nodes of the storage area network** (in paragraph 17 and paragraph 89); **and an interconnect coupling the processor, the memory unit, and the communication interface is inherent in order for the computer system to be enabled to execute the application and perform operations of the corresponding method claims** (see corresponding method claims).

15. Claim 17 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. (US 2003/0149769 A1) in view of Levine et al. (US 5,060,135).

As per claim 17, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **identifying a number of host resources able to access a corresponding storage device** (in paragraph 349 and figure 17) by selecting **storage device icons associated with the storage devices** (in paragraph 349 and figure 17), but Axberg does not specifically teach **selectively providing symbols near storage device icons associated with the storage devices** to perform the identifying. However, Levine teaches the insertion or removal of symbols near an icon to identify a number of associating elements of that which the icon represents (in column 17 lines 1-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Axberg with the teaching of Levine in order to quickly convey to the user the number of hosts corresponding to the storage device without user selection.

Claim 42 is the computer system claim corresponding to the method claim 17, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 17. Axberg further teaches **a processor** (in paragraph 133); **a memory unit that stores instructions associated with an application executed by the processor** (in paragraph 463 and 630); **a communication interface that supports communication with other nodes of the storage area network** (in paragraph 17 and paragraph 89); **and an interconnect coupling the processor, the memory unit, and the communication interface** is inherent in order for the **computer system to be enabled to execute the application and perform operations of the corresponding method claims** (see corresponding method claims).

**Conclusion**

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6295419 B1	Photo printing system and camera for the same	Kobayashi; Hideo et al.
US 20010047463 A1	Method and apparatus for controlling access to storage device	Kamano, Toshimitsu et al.
US 20020075312 A1	Displaying graphical information and user selected properties on a computer interface	Amadio, Louis et al.
US 20020143942 A1	Storage area network resource management	Li, Hua et al.
US 20030085914 A1	Method for connecting computer systems	Takaoka, Nobumitsu et al.
US 20030093509 A1	Storage area network methods and apparatus with coordinated updating of topology representation	Li, Raymond M. et al.
US 20030145041 A1	Storage area network methods and apparatus for display and management of a hierarchical file system extension policy	Dunham, Douglas Paul et al.
US 20030149752 A1	Storage area network methods and apparatus for communication and interfacing with multiple platforms	Baldwin, Duane Mark et al.
US 20030154281 A1	Storage system and method for controlling the same	Mitsuoka, Yoshio et al.
US 20030167327 A1	Storage area network methods and apparatus for topology rendering	Baldwin, Duane Mark et al.
US 6640278 B1	Method for configuration and management of storage resources in a storage network	Nolan; Shari J. et al.
US 20040064704 A1	Secure information display and access rights control	Rahman, Monis
US 6785728 B1	Distributed administration of access to information	Schneider; David S. et al.
US 6839746 B1	Storage area network (SAN) device logical relationships manager	Muthiyan; Abhijit et al.

Art Unit: 2178

US 20050091353 A1	System and method for autonomically zoning storage area networks based on policy requirements	Gopisetty, Sandeep K. et al.
US 7194538 B1	Storage area network (SAN) management system for discovering SAN components using a SAN management server	Rabe; Bruce R. et al.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Wong whose telephone number is 571-270-1399. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00 EST with every other Friday 7:30-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/812,511

Page 23

Art Unit: 2178

William Wong  
Patent Examiner

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Hong', with a stylized, cursive script.

**STEPHEN HONG**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**